arXiv:quant-ph/9807072v1 26 Jul 1998

Pulse Controlled Noise Suppressed Quantum Computation

Lu-Ming Duan*and Guang-Can Guo†
Department of Physics and Nonlinear Science Center,
University of Science and Technology of China,
Hefei 230026, People's Republic of China

Abstract

To make arbitrarily accurate quantum computation possible, practical realization of quantum computers will require suppressing noise in quantum memory and gate operations to make it below a threshold value. A scheme based on realistic quantum computer models is described for suppressing noise in quantum computation without the cost of stringent quantum computing resources.

*correspondence author
†Electronic address: gcguo@sunlx06.nsc.ustc.edu.cn

Quanum computation has become a very active field ever since the discovery that quantum computers can be much more powerful than their classical counterparts [1-3]. Quantum computers act as sophisticated quantum information processors, in which calculations are made by the controlled time evolution of a set of coupled two-level quantum systems (qubits). Coherence in the evolution is essential for taking advantage of quantum parallelism. However, there is a major obstacle to realization of quantum computation. Decoherence of the qubits caused by the inevitable interaction with noisy environment will make quantum information too fragile to be of any practical use. Recently, interest in quantum computation has increased dramatically because of two respects of advances toward overcoming the above difficulty. First, a combination of a series of innovative discoveries, such as quantum error correcting codes [4,5], fault-tolerant error correction techniques [6], and concatenated coding [7], has yielded the important threshold result [7,8], which promises that arbitrarily accurate quantum computation is possible provided that the error per operation is below a threshold value. Hence, noise below a certain level is not an obstacle to reliable quantum computation. Second, great progress has been made toward building the necessary quantum hardwares [9-11]. One particularly attractive physical system is the nuclear spin because of its good isolation from noisy environment. Some simple but real quantum computations have been demonstrated in bulk spin resonance quantum systems [12,13]; and a radical scheme, using semiconductor physics to manipulate nuclear spins, has been recently proposed, which indicates a promising route to large-scale quantum computation [14].

Fault-tolerant quantum error correction schemes are effective only when the error rate per operation is below a threshold value. Operations in quantum computers include transmission or storage of quantum states, and quantum logic.

For quantum logic, the estimated threshold error rate is about 10^{-6} [7,8]. Even for the most promising quantum hardware, the nuclear spin system, the real noise seems also necessarily beyond this threshold with the present technology [8]. Therefore, it is essentially important to further suppress noise before taking the procedure of fault-tolerant quantum error correction. Here, we propose a noise suppression scheme which operates by applying a sequence of bit-flipping or phase-flipping pulses on the system, with the pulse period less than the noise correlation time. It is shown that noise in the pulse-controlled system can be greatly reduced.

The scheme based on pulse control is relatively easy to implement in experiments. In fact, clever pulse methods (called refocusing techniques) have been developed for years in nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (NMR) to eliminate many kinds of classical dephasing effects [15]. In a recent work [16], Viola and Lloyd first used this technique to combat quantum noise in computer memory with a specific single-qubit dephasing model. In this paper, we consider the most general type of environmental noise, including classical or quantum dephasing and dissipation as its special case. By applying suitable pulse sequences, it is found that the noise in the controlled system is much reduced; and more importantly, the scheme can be readily extended to suppress noise in quantum gates (mainly referring to two-bit quantum gates, whose error rate is much larger than that of single-qubit rotations [9,14,17]). Suppose p_g is the error rate per operation, and p_0 is the additional error rate introduced by each pulse. Our result shows that the error rate per operation in the pulse-controlled system approximately reduces to $p_g p_0 t_{dec}/t_c$, where t_{dec} and t_c are respectively the decoherence time and the noise correlation time. Since p_0 can be made very small, the reducing factor $p_0 t_{dec}/t_c$ is much less than 1 even that the noise correlation time is considerably

smaller than the decoherence time. Therefore, by this scheme it is possible for the reduced error rate to attain the threshold value, say, 10^{-6}. This is a desirous result for reliable quantum computation. The only requirement in our scheme is that the pulses should be applied frequently so that the pulse period is less than the noise correlation time. This is experimentally feasible [11,15,16]. The scheme costs no additional quantum computing resources.

First we show how to use pulse control to combat decoherence of a single qubit in quantum memory. The qubit is described by Pauli's operator $\overrightarrow{\sigma}$. In the interaction picture, the most general form of the Hamiltonian describing single-qubit decoherence due to environmental noise can be expressed as (setting $\hbar = 1$)

$$H_I(t) = \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} \left[\sigma^\alpha \Gamma_\alpha(t)\right], \tag{1}$$

where $\Gamma_\alpha(t)$, generally independent of time, are noise terms, which may be classical stochastic variables or stochastic quantum operators, corresponding classical noise or quantum noise , respectively. For environmental noise in quantum computers, it is reasonable to assume that $\Gamma_\alpha(t)$ $(\alpha = x, y, z)$ satisfy the conditions $\langle \Gamma_\alpha(t) \rangle_{env} = 0$ and

$$\left\langle \Gamma_\alpha(t)\, \Gamma_\beta\left(t'\right)\right\rangle_{env} = f_{\alpha\beta}(\xi), \tag{2}$$

where $\langle \cdots \rangle_{env}$ denotes average over the environment. In Eq. (2), $f_{\alpha\beta}(\xi)$ $(\alpha, \beta = x, y, z)$ are correlation functions and $\xi = \frac{t-t'}{t_c}$. The quantity t_c characterizes the order of magnitude of noise correlation times. Different noise correlation terms may have different correlation times. But we assume that they have the same order of magnitude, which is denoted by t_c. For simplicity, in the following we directly call t_c the noise correlation time.

Suppose that the qubit is initially in a pure state $|\Psi(0)\rangle$. Under the Hamil-

tonian (1), after a short time t it evolves into the following mixed state

$$\rho(t) = \left\langle T\left\{e^{-i\int_0^t H_I\left(t'\right)dt'}\right\}|\Psi(0)\rangle\langle\Psi(0)|T\left\{e^{i\int_0^t H_I\left(t'\right)dt'}\right\}\right\rangle_{env}, \qquad (3)$$

where $T\{\cdots\}$ indicates that time-ordered product is taken in the bracket. The difference between the states $\rho(t)$ and $|\Psi(0)\rangle$ stands for errors. The error rate p can be described by $p = 1 - F(t)$, where $F(t)$ is the input-output state fidelity, defined as $F(t) = \langle\Psi(0)|\rho(t)|\Psi(0)\rangle$. From Eqs. (1) (2) and (3), it is not difficult to obtain an explicit perturbative expression for the error rate. Up to the second order of the Hamiltonian, the result is

$$p = 2\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\left\langle\Delta\sigma^\alpha\Delta\sigma^\beta\right\rangle_s\int_0^t\int_0^{t_1} f_{\alpha\beta}\left(\frac{t_2}{t_c}\right)dt_2dt_1, \qquad (4)$$

where $\Delta\sigma^\alpha = \sigma^\alpha - \langle\sigma^\alpha\rangle_s$, and $\langle\cdots\rangle_s$ denotes average over the system. Equation (4) is derived with a pure input state. However, it remains true when the qubit is initially in a mixed state. In this case, we define the error rate by $p = 1 - F_e(t)$, where $F_e(t)$ is the entanglement fidelity [18], a natural extension of the input-output fidelity to the mixed state circumstance. With this definition, the expression for the error rate remains completely same as Eq. (4).

Now we show how to use pulse control to reduce the error rate in quantum memory. We apply a sequence of bit-flipping or phase-flipping pulses on the qubit, with the pulse period t_Δ and pulse width t_w. It is required that $t_w << t_\Delta$ so that the environment-induced system evolution during the short time t_w is negligible. At time $t = 0$, no pulse is applied, and its operation is represented by the unit operator I. At time $t = t_\Delta$, we begin to apply in turn the bit-flipping and the phase-flipping pulses. The pulse-induced operations are thus respectively $I, \sigma^x, \sigma^z, \sigma^x, \sigma^z, \cdots$. Four pulse periods make up a control period. In the $(n+1)$th control period (form time $4nt_\Delta$ to time $4(n+1)t_\Delta$), the effective

system evolution under pulse control is represented by the following evolution operator

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{n+1} &= \sigma^z T\left\{\exp\left[-i\int_{(4n+3)t_\Delta}^{(4n+4)t_\Delta} H_I\left(t'\right)dt'\right]\right\}\sigma^x T\left\{\exp\left[-i\int_{(4n+2)t_\Delta}^{(4n+3)t_\Delta} H_I\left(t'\right)dt'\right]\right\} \\
&\times\sigma^z T\left\{\exp\left[-i\int_{(4n+1)t_\Delta}^{(4n+2)t_\Delta} H_I\left(t'\right)dt'\right]\right\}\sigma^x T\left\{\exp\left[-i\int_{4nt_\Delta}^{(4n+1)t_\Delta} H_I\left(t'\right)dt'\right]\right\} \\
&= -T\left\{\exp\left[-i\int_{(4n+3)t_\Delta}^{(4n+4)t_\Delta}\sigma^y\sigma^x H_I\left(t'\right)\sigma^x\sigma^y dt' - i\int_{(4n+2)t_\Delta}^{(4n+3)t_\Delta}\sigma^y H_I\left(t'\right)\sigma^y dt'\right.\right. \\
&\qquad\left.\left. -i\int_{(4n+1)t_\Delta}^{(4n+2)t_\Delta}\sigma^x H_I\left(t'\right)\sigma^x dt' - i\int_{4nt_\Delta}^{(4n+1)t_\Delta} H_I\left(t'\right)dt'\right]\right\} \\
&= -T\left\{\exp\left[-i\int_{4nt_\Delta}^{4(n+1)t_\Delta}\sum_{\alpha=x,y,z}\left[\sigma^\alpha\Gamma'_\alpha\left(t'\right)\right]dt'\right]\right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $T\{\cdots\}$ denotes the time-ordered product. The effective noise terms $\Gamma'_\alpha\left(4nt_\Delta+t\right)$ with $\alpha=x,y,z$ and $0\le t<4t_\Delta$ in Eq. (5) are defined respectively as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma'_x\left(4nt_\Delta+t\right) &= \tfrac{1}{4}\left[\Gamma_x\left(4nt_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)+\Gamma_x\left(4nt_\Delta+t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)\right. \\
&\left. -\Gamma_x\left(4nt_\Delta+2t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)-\Gamma_x\left(4nt_\Delta+3t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma'_y\left(4nt_\Delta+t\right) &= \tfrac{1}{4}\left[\Gamma_y\left(4nt_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)-\Gamma_y\left(4nt_\Delta+t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)\right. \\
&\left. +\Gamma_y\left(4nt_\Delta+2t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)-\Gamma_y\left(4nt_\Delta+3t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma'_z\left(4nt_\Delta+t\right) &= \tfrac{1}{4}\left[\Gamma_z\left(4nt_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)-\Gamma_z\left(4nt_\Delta+t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)\right. \\
&\left. -\Gamma_z\left(4nt_\Delta+2t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)+\Gamma_z\left(4nt_\Delta+3t_\Delta+\tfrac{t}{4}\right)\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

After pulse control, the only difference in the system evolution (5) is that the noise terms $\Gamma_\alpha(t)$ are replaced by the corresponding effective noise terms $\Gamma'_\alpha(t)$. Form Eqs. (2) and (6-8), it is not difficult to get the correlations of the effective noise $\Gamma'_\alpha(t)$. Then, substituting these correlations into Eq. (4), we obtain the error rate p_c after pulse control. The final result is

$$\frac{p_c}{p} = \alpha\left(\frac{t_\Delta}{t_c}\right)^2, \tag{9}$$

where t_c is the noise correlation time. The normalized constant α can be approximated by the following expression

$$\alpha \simeq \frac{\sum\limits_{\alpha,\beta} \left\langle \Delta\sigma^{\alpha}\Delta\sigma^{\beta} \right\rangle_s \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1/t_c} \Delta_\alpha \Delta_\beta \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} f_{\alpha\beta}(\xi)\, d\xi dt_1}{\sum\limits_{\alpha,\beta} \left\langle \Delta\sigma^{\alpha}\Delta\sigma^{\beta} \right\rangle_s \int_0^t \int_0^{t_1/t_c} f_{\alpha\beta}(\xi)\, d\xi dt_1}, \tag{10}$$

where $\Delta_x \simeq -1$, $\Delta_y \simeq -\frac{1}{2}$, and $\Delta_z \simeq o\left(t_\Delta/t_c\right)$. The symbol $o\left(t_\Delta/t_c\right)$ indicates that Δ_z and t_Δ/t_c have the same order of magnitude. By this notation, we have $\alpha \simeq o(1)$. The factor α is unimportant to our result and will be omitted in the following discussion. From Eq. (10), it follows that through pulse control the error rate in quantum memory can be reduced by a factor proportional to the second order of the rate of the pulse period to the noise correlation time.

In fact, by applying more complicate pulse sequences, the error rate can be further reduced. For example, we may apply the pulse sequence $I, \sigma^x, \sigma^z, \sigma^x, I, \sigma^x, \sigma^z, \sigma^x, I, \cdots$, with the pulse period t_Δ. In this sequence, a control period consists of eight pulse periods. We can similarly calculate the error rate of the system controlled by this pulse sequence. The result is that the error rate is reduced by a factor proportional to $\left(t_\Delta/t_c\right)^4$. In general, if we apply a pulse sequence with the control period consisting of 2^{n+1} pulse periods, the error rate is able to be reduced by a factor proportional to $\left(t_\Delta/t_c\right)^{2n}$.

In the above, we considered decoherence of a single qubit. Now, Suppose that there are L qubits, described respectively by Pauli's operators $\overrightarrow{\sigma}_l$. In the interaction picture, the Hamiltonian describing decoherence of L qubits can be generally expressed as

$$H_L(t) = \sum_l \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} \left[\sigma_l^{\alpha} \Gamma_l^{\alpha}(t)\right], \tag{11}$$

where the noise terms satisfy the conditions $\left\langle \Gamma_l^{\alpha}(t) \right\rangle_{env} = 0$ and

$$\left\langle \Gamma_l^{\alpha}(t)\, \Gamma_{l'}^{\beta}\left(t'\right) \right\rangle_{env} = f_{ll'}^{\alpha\beta}\left(\frac{t-t'}{t_c}\right). \tag{12}$$

The above description of many qubit decoherence is quite general. It includes independent decoherence and cooperative decoherence as its special case [19,20]. For reducing decoherence of this system, the control method is very simple. We need only apply the above pulse sequence separately on each qubit. It is easy to know that the error rate of the controlled system will be reduced by a factor proportional to $(t_\Delta/t_c)^{2n}$, where n depends on which pulse sequence is chosen.

To make fault-tolerant quantum computation possible, noise in quantum gates should be suppressed as well as noise in quantum memory. The pulse control scheme can be readily extended to include quantum gate operations. Any quantum gate can be decomposed into a series of quantum controlled-NOT (CNOT) gates together with some single-qubit rotations [21]. In general, the time required to perform quantum CNOT is much larger than the running time of single qubit rotations [9,14,17]. Therefore, environmental noise has much more influence on the quantum CNOT than on single-qubit rotations. To make fault-tolerant quantum computation possible, the key step is thus to suppress environmental noise in quantum CNOT gates. The quantum CNOT logic makes use of direct or indirect interaction between the qubits. The interaction is usually described by the following effective Hamiltonian [11,14]

$$H_g = \sum_{ll'} g_{ll'}(t)\, \overrightarrow{\sigma}_l \cdot \overrightarrow{\sigma}_{l'}, \tag{13}$$

where $g_{ll'}(t)$, possibly independent of time, are coupling coefficients. The environmental noise in these gates can be easily suppressed by the pulse control method. We need only synchronize the pulses acting on different qubits. The synchronized pulses induce either a collective bit flip $\otimes_l \sigma_l^x$ or a collective phase flip $\otimes_l \sigma_l^z$. The gate Hamiltonian remains unchanged under these operations, i.e.,

$$(\otimes_l \sigma_l^x)\, H_g\, (\otimes_l \sigma_l^x) = (\otimes_l \sigma_l^z)\, H_g\, (\otimes_l \sigma_l^z) = H_g. \tag{14}$$

Hence the quantum CNOT logic is not influenced by the pulses, whereas the environmental noise (described by the Hamiltonian (11)) is greatly suppressed.

We have shown that environmental noise, whether in quantum memory or in quantum gates, all can be reduced by the pulse control method. In the analyses, we make an ideal assumption that the pulses introduce no additional noise. If the inaccuracy of the pulse is considered, an additional error rate p_0 will be introduced by each pulse. Now we estimate in this circumstance to what amount the error rate per quantum operation can be reduced through pulse control. Let t_g and p_g denote the running time and the environment-induced error rate of the operation, respectively, then t_g/t_Δ defines the number of pulses applied during the operation. After pulse control, the error rate approximately becomes

$$p_g^{'} \simeq p_g \left(\frac{t_\Delta}{t_c}\right)^{2n} + \frac{t_g}{t_\Delta} p_0 \geq p_g \left(2n+1\right) \left(\frac{p_0 t_g}{2n p_g t_c}\right)^{\frac{2n}{2n+1}}, \tag{15}$$

where the minimum is attained when $t_\Delta = \left(\frac{p_0 t_g t_c^{2n}}{2n p_g}\right)^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}$, which is the optimal value for the pulse period. The parameter n in Eq. (15) depends on which pulse sequence is chosen. If $2n$ is considerably large, $p_g^{'}/p_g \simeq \left(p_0 t_g\right)/\left(p_g t_c\right)$. For environment-induced error, p_g can be approximated by $p_g \simeq t_g/t_{dec}$ [17], where t_{dec} is the decoherence time. With this approximation, we have $p_g^{'}/p_g \simeq p_0 t_{dec}/t_c$. The error rate is reduced by a very small factor $p_0 t_{dec}/t_c$. This suggests that the pulse control method is very effective.

Compared with other noise suppression schemes, the pulse control method has several remarkable features. First, it costs no additional qubits. This is an important feature since with the present technology, quantum computing resources are still very stringent [10,11,22]. Only small quantum systems have been demonstrated experimentally. For these systems, it is impossible to perform fault-tolerant quantum error correction, but the pulse control scheme works

well. Second, in the pulse control scheme, no encoding, decoding, and error correction are required, and no measurement is performed. Hence, in contrast to quantum error correction, this scheme introduces no slowdown of the computation speed. Last but not the least, pulse control is relatively a mature technology in experiments, especially in the NMR systems [15]. The pulse control method, combined with fault-tolerant quantum error correction, may ultimately make reliable quantum computation possible.

Acknowledgment

This project was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China.

References

[1] P. W. Shor, in Proc. of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (IEEE Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 1994), pp.124-134.

[2] S. Lloyd, Science 273, 1073 (1996).

[3] L. K. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 325 (1997).

[4] P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A 52, R2493 (1995).

[5] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 793 (1996).

[6] D. P. DiVincenzo and P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3260 (1996).

[7] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. H. Zurek, Science 279, 342 (1998).

[8] J. Preskill, Proc. R. Soc. London A 454, 385 (1998).

[9] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 4091 (1995).

[10] C. Monroe et al., ibid 75, 4714 (1995).

[11] N. A. Gershenfeld and I. L. Chuang, Science 275, 350 (1997).

[12] I. L. Chuang et al., Nature 393, 143 (1998).

[13] D. G. Cory et al., quant-ph/9802018.

[14] B. E. Kane, Nature 393, 133 (1998); D. P. DiVincenzo, ibid 393, 113 (1998).

[15] C. P. Slichter, *Principles of Magnetic Resonance*, 3rd. ed. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990).

[16] fL. Viola and S. Lloyd, quant-ph/9803057.

[17] D. P. DiVincenzo, Science 270, 255 (1995).

[18] B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A 54, 2614 (1996).

[19] L. M. Duan and G. C. Guo Phys. Rev. A 56, 4466 (1997).

[20] L. M. Duan and G. C. Guo Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 1953 (1997).

[21] S. Lloyd, ibid 75, 346 (1995).

[22] W. S. Warren, N. A. Gershenfeld, and I. L. Chuang, Science 277, 1688 (1997).